



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,611	06/18/1999	C. PHILLIP REAY	ONAD0002	7867

25268 7590 03/04/2002

LAW OFFICES OF RONALD M ANDERSON
600 108TH AVE, NE
SUITE 507
BELLEVUE, WA 98004

EXAMINER

HAQ, NAEEM U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/336,611

Applicant(s)

REAY ET AL.

Examiner

Naeem Haq

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "System and Method for Online Registration of Digital Products"

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7, 8, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7 and 8 recite the limitation "the e-commerce agency" in lines 2 and 9 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Furthermore claim 7 recites the phrase "related data" in line 10. It is unclear to the examiner exactly what data is being recorded in the database of the e-commerce agency. For these reasons, these claims are rendered vague and indefinite.

Claim 35 recites the phrase "...receiving the unique identifier for each softgood either from the creator computers before distribution of the softgood to prospective purchasers, or from a user of the softgood at a sale of the softgood..."(lines 16-18). The use of the word "or" in the phrase renders the claim vague and indefinite since the two alternatives are not equivalent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 20, 24, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ronning (US 5,883,955). Ronning teaches a method and computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for controlling play of a softgood on a computer using a player program, said player program also being employed to purchase the softgood through a network transaction, comprising the steps of:

- enabling a user to preview the softgood on the computer within the player program (column 4, lines 56-67; column 5, lines 1-3);
- enabling the user to purchase the softgood through a transaction conducted from within the player program (column 5, lines 4-15).

Art Unit: 2165

Ronning also teaches the steps of confirming that a financial account number is valid and transmitting a registration value to the purchaser (column 11, lines 1-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molnar et al (US 5,166,886) in view of Stefik et al (US 5,629,980).

Referring to claim 1, Molnar discloses a method for facilitating automated sale of softgoods, comprising the steps of: providing a unique identifier for the softgood (column 15, lines 21-22); distributing the softgood to prospective purchasers (column 15, lines 35-57); providing an agency having a server that implements softgood purchase transactions and maintains a database in which data relating to the sale of softgoods are stored, unique identifiers of the softgoods being referenced in the database to track the softgood purchase transactions (column 3, lines 15-67; column 4, lines 1-43; Figure 1, item 20). Molnar does not teach that the unique identifier specifically references the creator of the softgoods. However, Stefik teaches a method of distributing softgoods wherein an identifier references the creator of the softgood (column 6, lines 31-60; column 7, lines 6-13; column 11, table 1; lines 33-34). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Stefik into the method of Molnar.

Art Unit: 2165

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order keep a record of the creator with the softgood.

Referring to claim 2, Molnar and Stefik do not teach that the unique identifier for the softgood also references a unique identifier for the program provided to the creator. However, it is well know in the art to provide a unique serial number for each softgood that requires registration. Such a serial number can be used to identify anything a vendor desires (e.g. a program used to create a softgood). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate a unique serial number into the softgoods of Molnar and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to assist in internal tracking and accounting of the softgoods.

Referring to claims 3, 4, and 7, Molnar and Stefik teach all the limitations of claim 1 as noted above. Furthermore Stefik teaches that a unique identifier of a digital work is assigned to a server (column 9, lines 63-66). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Stefik into the method of Molnar. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to automate the registration of the unique identifier with the server.

Referring to claim 5, Molnar and Stefik teach all the limitations of claim 1 as noted above. Furthermore, Stefik teaches including a base price within each softgood prior to the step of distributing the softgood (column 6, lines 51-56). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made,

Art Unit: 2165

to incorporate the price of Stefik into the method of Molnar. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to automatically show the purchaser the price of the softgood.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Molnar and Stefik, and further in view of Ronning. Molnar and Stefik teach all the limitations of claim 1 as noted above. Molnar and Stefik do not teach providing a program for playing the softgood that also communicates with the server to enable the purchase of the softgood. However, Ronning teaches a system of softgood registration wherein a player program is used to play a softgood and to communicate with the server over a network (column 4, lines 45-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Ronning into the method of Molnar and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a more natural interface for the user.

Claims 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning (US 5,883,955) and Stefik, and further in view of Bernard et al (US 5,918,213). Ronning describes a method and computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for facilitating purchase of a softgood that is freely distributed to prospective purchasers for preview within a player program (column 3, lines 49-64; column 4, lines 57-65; Figure 3, item 46) comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2165

- enabling prospective purchasers to preview the softgood with the player program to a limited extent, prior to deciding to purchase the softgood (column 2, lines 15-29; column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 1-5, lines 57-65);
- enabling purchase of the softgood from within the player program by connecting a computer on which the player program is executing with the e-commerce agency to initiate a network transaction, purchase of the softgood causing related data to be recorded in the database of the e-commerce agency and causing a registration value to be transmitted to the computer on which the player program is executing (column 4, lines 23-55; column 5, lines 4-6; Figure 3, item 48; column 11, lines 1-67; column 12, lines 1-22);
- using the player program, registering the softgood on the computer employed for the network transaction using the registration value provided by the e-commerce agency, registration of the softgood on the computer enabling the softgood to be played by the player program beyond the limited extent of the preview (column 11, lines 1-67; column 12, lines 1-22).

Furthermore, Ronning also describes using the player program to transmit an identification of a purchaser of the softgood to the e-commerce agency during the network transaction, to enable the e-commerce agency to debit a financial account of the purchaser for a purchase price of the softgood (column 11, lines 6-8). Finally, Ronning teaches the step of sending a registration value to a purchaser over a network (column 11, lines 13- 32). Ronning does not teach that a unique identifier is assigned to the softgood. Ronning also does not teach including at least one of an identification of a

Art Unit: 2165

creator of the softgood, an identification of a software product used to produce the softgood, and a price in the softgood prior to its distribution. Finally, Ronning does not teach the step of including a prohibition of a purchaser modifying the softgood within the softgood. However, Stefik teaches assigning a unique identifier to the softgood, and including the identification of the creator and price in the softgood (column 6, lines 31-60; column 7, lines 6-13; column 9, lines 50-66; column 11, table 1; lines 33-34). Stefik also teaches prohibiting the purchaser from modifying the softgood (column 9, line 8; column 11, lines 33-34; column 40, lines 47-67; column 41, lines 1-39). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Stefik into the method and computer program of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to maintain a record of the creator and softgood, and to protect the authenticity of the softgood. Ronning and Stefik do not teach that the financial account numbers of purchasers of softgoods are stored in a database, or that purchasers' financial accounts are debited as a result of the network transaction. However, Bernard teaches creating membership profiles for users that contains financial information (column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the membership profiles of Bernard into the method and computer program of Ronning and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order provide a customer the convenience of not having to enter the same information each time an order was place.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning in view of Richardson III (US 5,490,216).

Referring to claim 21, Ronning teaches all the limitations of claim 20 as noted above. Ronning also teaches the step of registering a softgood on a computer so that the softgood is playable on the computer with the player program beyond the preview limit (column 11, lines 1-67; column 12, lines 1-22). Ronning does not teach that the registration value identifies a software program used to create the softgood. However, Ronning teaches generating a serial number for the registration of the softgood (column 11, lines 13-16). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the identity of the software program used to create the softgood into the serial number of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to maintain an accurate history of the softgood from development to installation.

Referring to claims 22 and 23, Ronning teaches all the limitations of claim 21 as noted above. Ronning does not teach the limitations of claims 22 and 23. However, Richardson III teaches a method of registering softgoods wherein if the softgood is transferred to a different computer after being purchased, the softgood must again be registered on the different computer to enable the softgood to be played beyond the preview limit on the different computer (column 2, lines 52-55; column 6, lines 34-67, column 7, lines 1-67; column 8, lines 1-38). Furthermore Richardson teaches that the registration value includes at least a name of the purchaser of the softgood (column 8, lines 15-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at

Art Unit: 2165

the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Richardson into the method of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure proper licensing procedures of the softgood had been followed.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary. Ronning teaches all the limitations of claim 21 as noted above. Ronning does not teach the step of employing the player program to transmit information over a network to implement purchase of a softgood, using a secure communication protocol. However, Microsoft Press teaches a method of Secure Socket Layer (SSL) which is used to encrypt and transmit financial account numbers over a network (page 425-426). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the SSL standard as taught by Microsoft in the player program of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to prevent interception of critical information.

Claims 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning and Bernard et al (US 5,918,213) and further in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary.

Referring to claim 25, Ronning teaches all the limitations of claim 21 as noted above. Furthermore, Ronning teaches storing the registration value so that the purchaser can again reregister the softgood on a computer (column 11, lines 9-13). Ronning does not teach maintaining a database on an e-commerce server in which an identification of each purchaser and a list of each softgood purchased by each

Art Unit: 2165

purchaser are included, to facilitate distribution of at least a portion of the purchase price of the softgood to a creator of the softgood. However, Bernard teaches the use of a database to facilitate the distribution of at least a portion of the purchase price of the softgood to a creator of the softgood (column 30, lines 42-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bernard into the method Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure that the creator was paid for his or her work.

Referring to claim 26, Ronning and Bernard teach all the limitations of claim 25 as noted above. Furthermore, Bernard teaches that the data stored in the database also includes a financial account number for each purchaser of softgoods, said financial account numbers being provided by the purchasers, further comprising the step of charging the financial account referenced by the financial account number of a purchaser during the transaction (column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bernard into the method of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to automate the purchase transaction for the purchaser.

Referring to claims 27 and 28, Ronning and Bernard teach all the limitations of claim 26 as noted above. Ronning and Bernard do not teach using the player program to encrypt a financial account number for transmission over a network. However, Microsoft Press teaches a method of Secure Socket Layer (SSL) which is used to

Art Unit: 2165

encrypt and transmit financial account numbers over a network (page 425-426).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the SSL standard as taught by Microsoft in the method of Ronning and Bernard. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to prevent interception of critical information.

Referring to claim 29, Ronning and Bernard teach all the limitations of claim 25 as noted above. Furthermore Bernard teaches that the database includes a current price for each softgood, and the step of advising a purchaser of the current price of the softgood being purchased during the transaction (column 10, lines 24-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bernard into the method of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to allow the purchaser to decide whether to actually purchase the product.

Claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning and Bernard, and further in view of Stefik.

Referring to claim 32, Ronning teaches a system for facilitating purchase of a softgood of which copies are freely distributed to prospective purchasers for preview prior to purchase, comprising:

- a purchaser computer that includes a first processor, a first memory in which a plurality of machine instructions are stored that implement a plurality of functions when executed by the processor, a first network interface coupling the computer in communication with a network, at least one user interface for input of data to

Art Unit: 2165

the memory, and a display on which graphics and text are displayed (Figure 2, items 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 30, and 40; column 4, lines 23-55);

- a remote computer that includes a second processor, a second memory in which are stored a plurality of machine instructions that implement a plurality of functions when executed by the second processor, a second network interface coupling the remote computer in communication with the network and thereby selectively coupling the remote computer in data communication with the purchaser computer via the network (Figure 2, items 40, 42);
- a softgood comprising machine instructions or media data that are loaded into the first memory of the purchaser computer, other of the machine instructions stored in the first memory comprising a player program that uses the softgood, said player program carrying out a plurality of the functions when the machine instructions of the player program are executed by the first processor (Figure 3), including:
 - i. enabling the softgood to be previewed to a limited extent prior to the user purchasing the softgood (column 4, lines 57-67);
 - ii. enabling the user to purchase the softgood in a transaction with the remote computer that is conducted over the network (column 5, lines 1-15);
 - iii. registering the softgood on the purchaser computer after the softgood has been purchased, said softgood being thus registered using a registration value provided by the remote computer (column 11, lines 1-67);

Art Unit: 2165

- iv. checking for the registration of the softgood on the purchaser computer and enabling the softgood to be used by the player program beyond the limited extent of the preview only if the softgood is determined to be registered on the purchaser computer (column 12, lines 12-13);
- wherein said plurality of functions implemented by said second processor in the remote computer include:
 - i. responding to a request to purchase the softgood received over the network from the purchaser computer (column 11, lines 1-67);
 - ii. confirming an approval of a credit purchase by the user of the purchaser computer with a credit approval agency that is coupled to the network (column 11, lines 6-8);
 - iii. determining the registration value as a function of at least the unique identifier of the softgood and sending the registration value to the remote computer over the network to register the softgood on the purchaser's computer (column 11, lines 13-32);

Ronning does not teach that the softgood includes a unique identifier that is included within the softgood before its distribution. However, Stefik teaches including a unique identifier in the softgood (column 6, lines 31-60; column 7, lines 6-13; column 9, lines 50-66; column 11, table 1; lines 33-34). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Stefik into the system of Ronning. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 2165

motivated to do so in order to protect the authenticity of the softgood. Ronning and Stefik do not teach the step of:

- iv. allocating a portion of a purchase price of the softgood set by terms of a prior agreement to a creator of the softgood.

However, Bernard teaches the use of a database to facilitate the distribution of at least a portion of the purchase price of the softgood to a creator of the softgood (column 30, lines 42-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bernard into the system Ronning and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure that the creator was paid for his or her work.

Referring to claim 33, Ronning, Stefik, and Bernard teach all the limitations of claim 32 as noted above. Furthermore, Bernard teaches checking the data stored in the database to determine if data for the user purchasing a softgood are already included within the database (column 3, lines 63-67; column 4, lines 1-20), and if so using a financial account number included in the data for implementing the purchase of the softgood (column 10, lines 39-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Bernard into the system of Ronning and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to automate the transaction for the purchaser.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ronning, Stefik, Bernard, and further in view of Richardson. Ronning, Stefik, and Bernard teach all the limitations of claim 32 as noted above. Ronning, Stefik, and

Art Unit: 2165

Bernard do not teach the limitation of claim 34. However, Richardson teaches that the registration value includes at least a name of the purchaser of the softgood (column 8, lines 15-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Richardson into the system of Ronning, Stefik, and Bernard. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure proper licensing procedures of the softgood.

Claims 35-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernard, Stefik, Ronning, and further in view of Richardson. Bernard teaches a system for facilitating automated sale of softgoods from which a revenue stream is returned to each creator of the softgoods, comprising:

- a server computer operated by the e-commerce agency, said server computer maintaining a database in which data relating to the softgoods are stored, said server computer also including a network interface coupling the server computer in communication with the network, a purchase of a softgood being initiated when a softgood is being used, said purchase by a user of the softgood causing the server computer to confirm approval of a credit transaction for the user by an on-line communication with a credit approval agency, and if the credit transaction is approved, to transmit a registration value over the network to a computer of the user to register the softgood on the computer of the user, to enter data related to the purchase within the database (column Figure 4, items 112, 404, 440, and 480, column 4, lines 44-67; column 5, lines 1-20).

Art Unit: 2165

Bernard also teaches that the server computer sends a current price to the user before the purchase is completed, said current price being stored in the data of the database (column 10, lines 35-39). Bernard does not teach limitation (a) of claim 35. However, Stefik teaches a creator program and computer used to produce a softgood, said computer interfaces a network to automate the sale of softgoods (column 6, lines 51-61; column 9, lines 63-66). Stefik also teaches that each of the softgoods include at least one of an identification of the creator of the softgood (columns 10-1, table 1, Property: "Revenue" and "Owner"). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Stefik into the system of Bernard. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to protect the authenticity of the softgood. Bernard and Stefik do not teach that the registration value is based on the user's name. However, Richardson teaches a system of software registration wherein the registration value is based on the user's name (column 8, lines 15-22). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Richardson into the system of Bernard and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to ensure proper licensing procedures of the softgood had been followed. Bernard and Stefik do not teach that a player program plays the softgood and communicates with the server over a network. Bernard and Stefik also do not teach that the preview of the softgood is limited, and that once the softgood is registered, the user is permitted use of the softgood as determined by the license. However, Ronning teaches a system of softgood registration wherein a player

Art Unit: 2165

program is used to play a softgood and to communicate with the server over a network (column 4, lines 45-67). Furthermore, Ronning teaches that the user is permitted a limited preview of the softgood until the user registers the softgood (column 11, lines 1-65; column 12, lines 1-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Ronning into the system of Bernard and Stefik. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to provide a more natural interface for the user.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naeem Haq whose telephone number is 703-305-3930. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours 8:00am – 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 703-308-1344. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


NH

February 25, 2002


WYNN COGGINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100